



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

How plainly right and truth may be on her side (cheers). It is against this that we are to raise, it is against this that we are to nourish an intrepid public opinion, which knows itself and will assert itself. We must nourish amongst us a public opinion which will not be afraid to stand up and say it is *foes* and *despise* progress, if progress be another name for plunder—which will not be afraid to say it is the enemy of what is called liberty, when it sees that in fact and truth liberty is but another name for the most degrading tyranny and knavery (cheers)—which will not be afraid to say, that it is the enemy of enlightenment, when it sees that in fact and truth what they call enlightenment, is nothing but a denial of God on the one hand, and a worship of the most degrading appetites of sense upon the other. These things rest upon us in a great measure. We cannot separate ourselves from our brethren abroad, and we are linked to a power which, for good or for evil, has got an *awful* predominance in the world. We must take our position as Catholics clearly and strongly, and for promoting the growth of such a public opinion this society is a most admirable instrument" (cheers).

We do not believe that since the days of the late repeal agitation, sentiments better calculated to foster alienation and animosity were ever uttered in an Irish assembly; and when we reflect that they were addressed to so inflammable and excitable a body as a meeting of the "Catholic Young Men's Society," and in the presence and under the sanction of the most distinguished Roman Catholic ecclesiastics, and some of the most eminent members of the Roman Catholic bar, who also took a prominent part in the proceedings, we cannot but think that the "increasing animosity and alienation," which the Earl of Carlisle so feelingly laments, is traced home to its true source—the policy of those whose interest it is to perpetuate the war of races, and prevent the practice of that mutual forbearance, respect, and tenderness which would otherwise spring up underneath what his Excellency happily describes as the "constraining influence of Christian tenderness and love."

So far, however, was the spirit of Mr. O'Hagan's animosity to England from being disapproved of by the prelate who presided on the occasion, that Dr. Cullen himself, in opening the meeting, not only did his best to rouse his auditory against what he calls proselytising schools, which (adopting the lowest cant phrase of the enemies of Protestantism) he elegantly denominates "souper" schools, and their religion "souperism,"* but, harping back upon the errors of a past century, did his utmost to rekindle and fan into flame the memory of the well-nigh forgotten penal laws of the seventeenth century, adding, with a degree of boldness which must have startled even an auditory prepared to accept anything from his lips, that there had never been *penal laws against Protestants in any [Roman] Catholic country*!!

"It is true," said Dr. Cullen, "that in Ireland, England, and Scotland the Catholic Church had not been able of late to take such a lead in learning: but the reason of that was clear, and known to all. The Catholic Church was crushed to the earth by penal laws (applause). If a father was anxious for the education of his child, and sent him to a Catholic school beyond the seas, he suffered the confiscation of his property. How could learning flourish among Catholics under such unfavourable circumstances?"

Now, it does so happen that the act against foreign education was wholly repealed so far back as 1792, no less than 66 years ago, so that in all probability there was not a single individual pre-

sent at the meeting who was able to remember the time when that statute was in force, or whose education could have been in any degree influenced by it. We can scarcely think, however, that there were many present whose education was so wretchedly one-sided and limited as to have believed the most reverend orator, when he hazarded the following unblushing statement:—

"They (the soupers) must be extremely ignorant of all history, to assert that the Catholic Church is opposed to the progress of knowledge. Look at *Catholic countries*: you will see NO PENAL LAWS AGAINST PROTESTANTS there; but if you look to the history of Ireland, what do you see? (Hear, hear.)"

Hear this ye martyrs of the Huguenots, the Waldenses, and countless victims of the Spanish Inquisition! Dr. Cullen's history ignores you and your pretended sufferings. There never were any penal laws in Italy, in France, in Spain, or Portugal! The Madai were a myth, John Huss a fiction, Carnesecchi an impostor; Galileo rewarded by the Roman Catholic Church, to prove how zealous the prelates have always been to promote the cultivation of science and extension of knowledge!

"If you refer," says Dr. Cullen, "to the history of our holy Church—if you refer to the history of Europe, you will find that in every age, at every period, the sovereign pontiff, the prelates, and leading dignitaries of the Catholic Church have been always most solicitous to promote the cause of useful knowledge and foster the cultivation of science" (hear, hear).

With this qualification, Dr. Cullen, that science and knowledge should always look one way, and submit to be in leading strings to the Church. They imposed no *penalties*, indeed, on those who submitted humbly to propagate their opinions exclusively "permissu superiorum." The *penalties*, including the last and worst, the dungeon and the faggot, were reserved only for those who ventured to shake off their bondage, and cultivate science, or promote knowledge in a Protestant spirit of freedom and independence of priestly tutelage. Whether science and knowledge will progress better in Austria, now that the Church of Rome has got the exclusive control of education there, may be well doubted by any who do not read history through Dr. Cullen's eyes, and see the benevolent spirit of his Church, even in the massacre of the Huguenots—or the *autos da fé* of Spain!

Dr. Cullen proceeds, however, with his address, and tries to excite the animosities of his youthful auditors against the respectable Protestants of Dublin, because they will not set themselves in opposition to the well considered and dignified admonitions of the eminent Bishop of Ossory, whose letter he refers to, without venturing a single remark in refutation of it.

"But I tell you," he proceeds, "with whom we should be very much displeased—with the respectable Protestants of Dublin, because they suffer themselves to be composed by so low and degraded a class of persons"—(meaning the clergy and laity in connection with the Irish Church Mission Society)—(hear, hear, and cheers). "Strangers who read the placards about our city must think that all the Protestants of Dublin were engaged in calumniating their Catholic neighbours (hear, hear). That is not the case; but the respectable Protestants of Dublin should raise their voices against those *souper* schools (hear, hear). The Protestants of Kilkenny, headed by Captain Helsham, a military man, have done so. They went to the Protestant bishop, and called upon him to disown the preaching of *souperism* that was being carried on in Kilkenny (hear, hear, and cheers)."

The doctor does not, however, venture to refer to the nature of the answer the memorialists received from that eminent prelate; and we think our readers will agree with us, when they read it for themselves, that a more calm, dignified, and conclusive document never issued from his distinguished pen. We leave them to form their own judgment, after its perusal, whether the increasing amount of religious alienation and animosity of which Lord Carlisle so feelingly complains, is justly attributable to such men as the Lord Bishop of Ossory, and those with whose

free agency and zealous exertions he so calmly but firmly refuses to interfere, or to Dr. Cullen, Mr. J. O'Hagan, and others, who misrepresent history, and calumniate England in a manner so offensive to every lover of candour and fair dealing, to say nothing of religious truth.

We record for the amusement of our readers the following specimen of the candid criticism and Christian charity with which we sometimes are favoured, as well in private letters as in a certain class of public journals. Our attention was first attracted to it in an English paper, into which it was transcribed from an Irish R. C. journal, but we need not say, with remarks of a very different character, which we refrain from repeating. It is at any rate brief and racy; though perhaps not quite so humiliating or hard to bear as if it had simply given a few instances, and *proced* them:—

"As the Lord hateth and His soul detesteth a deceitful witness that uttereth lies, and him that soweth discord among brethren, the author of that infernal vehicle of spiritual poison, deceitfully called the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, must indeed be peculiarly hateful and detestable in the sight of God. For he is a most deceitful witness, who incessantly uttereth the most diabolical lies against the Church of Christ, which is the pillar and ground of the truth. Catholics hate it as the devils hate holy water," &c.

Correspondence.

SUPREMACY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

RESPECTED SIR,—Having replied to some things in the first numbers of the "See of Peter," I now turn to the conclusion (Dec. 18, 1856, p. 185, &c.), where "we proceed," as you say, "to the scriptural arguments relied on by Roman Catholics as establishing the Pope's supremacy; and conceiving, as we do, that the final reference of all religious questions must be to the written word, &c." But, first, I must express my fears that this same "final reference" is likely to be also an endless one, as long as the written word is dumb, and its true sense (that is, the original sense in which it was first written) lost to some of us, in the lapse of 1800 years. Had you been alive to this you might have paused before making the bold avowal "that it was our Lord's intention to base His whole Church on any one man, however pre-eminent, would appear extremely improbable, as being inconsistent, in fact, with the whole current of Scripture. Christ Himself is always spoken of in Scripture as the rock. St. Paul, describing the heavenly Jerusalem, says, 'The wall had twelve foundations'; and that 'Jesus is the chief corner-stone.' Answer—But why not on any one woman? For where is the whole current of Scripture in favour of investing a woman with the spiritual supremacy, or of lodging it in the Crown? Secondly, Our Saviour Himself is certainly the main rock. Thirdly, St. John there, under the emblem of the heavenly Jerusalem, is depicting the glory of the saints in heaven, where we grant St. Peter has no supremacy, and where virtue alone is rewarded.

II. "So far is it from being the fact that *all* the fathers held such to be the meaning of the passage in question, that there is nothing in Scripture on which there is so much difference of interpretation among them. Some apply it, apparently at least, to St. Peter personally; others to the Apostles generally; a third class, by far the most numerous and important, including SS. Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Augustine, apply it to the faith which Peter had just confessed," &c. Answer—"Such" what? Is this an inscription that the fathers were divided on the subject of St. Peter's supremacy? If so, then your argument stands thus—Some of the fathers apply the rock to Peter's faith; but they also, in other places, apply it (as will be seen) to his person; ergo, the fathers denied, or were divided on, the supremacy!! What would Locke or the Archbishop say of logic like this? If any of the ancients understood the rock either of St. Peter's faith or of Christ, they must either have mistaken the literal, or have applied it to a casual sense; as did St. Augustine, who applies it sometimes to St. Peter: "Count the priests even to St. Peter's see; mark the succession in that rank of fathers; that is, the rock which the gates of hell do not overcome" (in Psalm. lxxix., sect. 4, Tract. xi., in Joan. sect. 5, &c. in Psal. contra part. Donat). Sometimes he applies it to Christ. His doubt was caused by his ignorance of Hebrew; for he supposed "that Cephas was not a primitive noun signifying a rock, but only a derivative, as Christian is derived from Christ." This he tells us was his reason, "Because it was not said to Peter, thou art a rock, but thou art Peter" (Lib. i., Recract. c. 21). And it is well known that to apply a text to a casual sense is not to deny its literal sense. Thus, when St. Jerome said, "that it was not St. Peter's person, but his faith,

* The whole passage is as follows—"I cannot say so much in praise of the second class of schools, either in a literary or religious point of view—the proselytising schools established for the perversion of poor Catholics. You all know their history pretty well. They were established here in the time of the famine for the purpose of perverting the children of the poor. They established schools in which they taught the poor children, and therefore they are called *soupers*; and they sought in giving the soup to undermine the faith of these children, and therefore their religion is called *souperism*." We thought this false charge had been long since exploded by the indignant assertion of scripture. Whately, that after a careful inquiry he could never discover that a single instance of such disreputable conduct had been pointed out even by their opponents, except one, and that one generally 16 years before the famine! We are so convinced of the falsehood of the charge, that we here solemnly call on Dr. Cullen to state publicly, where, when, and by whom soup was ever given by Protestants to Roman Catholic children on the terms of their attendance on scripture, or, if he will so call them, proselytising schools.

* Matt. xvi. 18.

that walked the waters" (Epist. 61, ad Pamphach. tom. 2, p. 244), it is clear that either the ancient sense of the written word was quite opposite to the modern, or else that St. Jerome was speaking allegorically, or implying that St. Peter's faith was the efficient cause which enabled him (in person) to walk on the sea. Therefore, when any of the fathers refer the rock to St. Peter's faith, it is beyond doubt they mean that he only merited this title by his faith. For, though we often say that the great Duke's heroism deserved a reward, yet both he and we would have looked blank enough on learning that the half-million, for which the nation was taxed, was to be settled on his heroism, while his self was not to fob a penny.

III. "Launoy gives 17 extracts from the fathers, in which St. Peter is spoken of as the rock; and 44 which treat the faith by Peter confessed as the rock." Ans.—Here must be some mistake; for there are, at least, 51 passages in the fathers which positively apply the words to St. Peter. St. Cyprian never understands them otherwise, though he insists on them extremely often. "Peter," says he, "whom Christ had chosen to be chief, and upon whom He built His Church" (Epist. 71, ad Quint.). Also, (Epist. 55, ad Cornel. et 70, ad Januar. et 40 plebi sua. et 73 ad Jubian, et Lib. de bono Patientie, et Lib. de Discip., et Habit. Virginum, et Lib. de unitat. Eccles.) And Firmilian (Epist. 75 ejusdem).

So Tertullian, "Peter, who was called the rock, on which the Church was to be built" (De Praesc.). Origen—"Hear what was said by the Lord to that great foundation of the Church, to that most steadfast rock on which Christ built His Church" (Homil. v. in Exod., n. 4). Again, "Peter was by the Lord called a rock, since to him He said, 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church,' &c. (Series Comment. in Matt. n. 139). Also (T. iv. in Joan., Tom. v. p. 95); and (Comment. in Epist. Roman. c. 6). So they are understood by St. Leo (Serm. 2 et 3 de Assumptione sua, et serm. 4 in Natal. Ordinat., et serm. 51 homil. sabint. ante secund. Dom. Quad., et serm. 62 de Pass. Domini, et Epist. cxix. ad Maxim. Antioch., et serm. 62 de Pass. Domini). St. Hilary (in Psal. cxxxi., et in Psal. cxli., et Comment. in Matt. c. xvi.) St. Gregory of Nyssa (De St. Stephen. t. vi. p. 600, Galland.). St. Gregory Nazianzum (Carm. i. t. vi. p. 423, Galland.; et t. i. p. 454, *ibid.*; et Car. 2, t. 2, p. 51, *ibid.*). St. Basil (Advers. Eunom. n. 4). St. Jerome (Epist. ad Marcellum xli. n. 2. et contra. Pelag. n. 14, et lib. iii. in Matt. col. 124). St. Epiphanius (Advers. heres. s. 59, et t. 2 in Anchor. n. 9). St. Cyril of Alexandria (t. iv. tom. in Joan. p. 131). St. Paulinus (Ep. 4, ad Severum. t. v. Bibl. Lat. Colon. p. 156). St. Asterius (Homil. in Apost. Petri et Pauli t. i., Paris, 1648; vel Edit. Comb. serm. 8, p. 146). St. Maximus (Homil. iv. de Petri). Theodoret (t. iii. orat. de carit. p. 1809). St. Pacian (Epist. iii. n. xi. p. 265, tom. vi., Galland.). P. Orosius (once). James of Nisibis (Orat. vii. de Poenitentia, p. 57, tom. v., Galland.). St. Ephrem the Syrian (de Sacerdot.). and also St. Augustin (Epist. 53, ad Generum. Et Tract. 124 in Joan. n. 5). St. Chrysostom (Homil. iv. de Verbis Isaiae., tom. i. p. 609; Edit. Antwerp. an. 1614. Et Homil. in Psal. l. p. 383, *ibid.*). And St. Ambrose (Lib. iv. de Fide, c. v., n. 56, p. 531, t. ii, Et de Incarn. c. 45); quoted by you. At the great Council of Ephesus, anno. 431, where assembled the Oriental and Latin Church, the Roman legate says, *semine contradicunt*, "It is a thing known to all ages that St. Peter, prince and head of the Apostles, who is the foundation of the Catholic Church, received from Christ the keys of the kingdom, and who to this time, and always, lives in his successors and exercises his authority; whose successor, Celestine, holding his place, has sent us to this council to represent his person" (T. 3, Conc. Labb. p. 626, A).

In the General Council of Chalcedon, 520 bishops being present, St. Peter is called "the rock and the foundation of the Church; which, as it is the literal sense of Matt. xvi. 18, so is it the undoubted language of antiquity, and both of the Greek and Latin fathers.

IV. "Origen says, 'If you think the whole Church to be built only on Peter, what will you say of John?' 2nd. St. Jerome says, 'You say the Church is built on Peter, but the same in another place is built on all the apostles.' 3rd. Firmilian, according to Rigaltius, says, 'that not to Peter alone were the keys given, &c.' Answer—Let Origen thus explain himself. "What previously (Matt. xvi. 19) was given to Peter alone, seems here to be given to all who have three admonished sinners. But, since it was fit, even though something was said in common of Peter and of these, that Peter should have something peculiar above them: this had been previously decreed for Peter alone. Accordingly, 'I will give to thee the keys, &c.' was said before 'and whatsoever ye shall bind, &c.'; and if we read carefully the Evangelist we shall there find a wide distinction and pre-eminence in the words spoken to Peter above those spoken in the latter place" (T. iii. in Matt. Tom. xiii., p. 613., Benedict). 2nd. And St. Jerome, if he is let, will also explain himself, for his very next words are: "But for this reason one was chosen from the twelve, that a head being constituted there might be no occasion of schism." 3rd. Firmilian's words, according to Firmilian himself, are—"To Peter alone Christ said,

"Whatever thou shalt bind, &c." (Inter epist. St. Cyprian, 75).

In the ensuing numbers of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN the other texts⁶ are, at great length, examined, interpreted, and even the usual interpretations of the fathers thereon interpreted by you; but, since scarce any text can be proof against sophistry, instead of daring to give my own interpretation of an ancient, I will either let him speak for himself or through the Protestant Scholast. Tied by this rule, I am therefore prevented from following you in your exposition, which is—"that all the apostles were shepherds, as well as Peter;" but here St. Maximus, of the 5th century, will answer for me, and perhaps tell you that they were shepherds in the same sense in which "both Peter and Paul received keys—the latter of wisdom, the former of power." (Homil. v. de Eod. Fest.)

Meantime, you seem to forget that Catholics understand these texts, not for the idle purpose of determining whether or not the Apostles were all shepherds, but for St. Peter's supremacy; and that the fathers understood them in this sense we have abundant evidence.

St. Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons, in the 5th century, explains the text⁷ we are upon in this manner:—"First," says he, "He entrusted him with His lambs, next with His sheep, because He made him not only a shepherd, but the shepherd of shepherds. Peter, then, feeds the lambs; he also feeds the sheep; he feeds both the young and their mothers, he rules both subjects and prelates; he is, therefore, a shepherd over all, for besides lambs and sheep there is nothing in the Church" (In nativitat. St. Joan. Evang. p. 24, Antwerp, 1555).

St. Asterius, Bishop of Amasea, in Pontus, also of the fifth age, understood this text in the same manner. "Christ," says he, "being about to ascend, and having thrice asked St. Peter, 'Lovest thou me?' recommends the whole Church to him spread over the whole world, as a peculiar depositum and his proper charge. Thus, Peter having heard the words, 'Feed my lambs,' took upon him the care of the world as one fold, one shepherd." (Serm. 8, p. 146. Edit. Comb. vel. Homil. in Apost. Princ. Petri et Pauli. t. 1. Edit. Paris, 1618.) Hence, St. Asterius, in the same treatise, twice calls St. Peter "the first, or chief of the Apostles."

And St. Cyprian—"Christ speaks to Peter, saying to him, 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church,' &c.; and after His resurrection He says to him again, 'Feed my sheep.'" (Lib. de unit. Eccles.) From these two texts St. Cyprian draws two conclusions.

The first is—"Christ builds His Church upon one." (Super unum adificat ecclesiam suam.)

The second is—"Christ, to show the unity of the Church, ordained that one man should be the centre of that very unity." (*Ibid.*) This he says with respect to the Apostles; for, in regard of all other Christians, he grants that they had an equal power, both in the range of their charge and as to the authority of their commission, which was from Christ Himself. (John xx. 21, &c.; Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.)

Origen—"When the chief power of feeding the sheep was given to Peter, and the Church was built upon him as upon a rock, the profession of no other virtue but charity was required of him."

St. Orosius, of Egypt, anno 349—"He said to Simon Peter, the prince of the Apostles Simon, son of Jona, 'Lovest thou me, &c. Three times did He bid him feed His sheep, and through him has He imposed this office on us all.' (Doctrin. de Institut. Monach. p. 42, tom. v. Galland.)

St. Ephrem, of Syria, 4th century—"Cephas was the prince of the Apostles; he received the keys, and was acknowledged the shepherd of the flock." (T. ii. Syr. Serm. 56, advers. Heres. p. 559.)

St. Epiphanius—"That chief of the Apostles, that firm rock upon which the Church of God is built, against which the gates of hell—that is, heretics—shall not prevail—he heard from that same God—Peter, feed my lambs; to him was given the flock." (Tom. 2, in Anchor.)

St. Ambrose—"Simon, Son of Jonas, loveth thou me: Yea, Lord, thou knowest, &c.; Jesus saith to him, Feed my sheep; and, therefore, he is chosen chief over all; and now is not ordered to feed, as at first, his lambs merely, but his sheep, that the more perfect might govern the more perfect." (In Lucam. lib. x., n. 175, &c.) And what he thought of St. Peter's power by virtue of the keys appears from this—"What fellowship can these Novatians have with thee, O Lord; people who receive not the keys, and deny that they ought to forgive sins, in which, forsooth, they are not mistaken; for they have not Peter's inheritance who have not Peter's chair, which, with impious schism, they rend aunder; but they are heinous in denying that in the Church sins can be pardoned; for to Peter it was said, 'To thee I will give the keys, &c.; and whatsoever thou shalt loose, &c.' (T. ii. de Pæn. b. v. c. vi. n. 33, p. 399.)

Cassian, in the 5th century, is to the same effect—"Peter, prince of the Apostles, mayest thou open to us the gate of which thou didst receive the keys; exclude all trespassers through illicit entrances; for heaven is open to none till unlocked by thee." (De Incar. lib. iii.)

St. Peter Chrysologus—"When about to ascend He

resigns His sheep to Peter to be fed in His absence; 'Peter,' says he, 'lovest thou me? feed my sheep.' (Serm. vi. in Psal. xcix.)

St. Chrysostom—"Jesus says to Peter, 'Lovest thou me? And why, passing by the rest, does He address Peter? He was the chosen one of the Apostles, and the head of the choir (η σημαντη ρα χρυσος). Hence it was that Paul had recourse to him before the rest, and having remedied his fall, He gives him the jurisdiction over the brethren, saying, 'If you love me preside over the brethren.' (Homil. lxxxviii. in Joan. p. 598, t. 8. Galland.)

These words, "feed my sheep," and "strengthen thy brethren," seem to import the exercise of the very same office; for, St. Chrysostom, treating of the election of St. Matthias (Acts i.), says thus of St. Peter—"See how he acknowledges the flock entrusted to him by Christ; how he is the prince in this choir! He had reason to act here the first of all with authority, having them all delivered into his hands (παντας της προσεδοξης); for to him Christ said, 'When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.' (Homil. iii. in Acta Apost. p. 181-182. tom. iii. edit. Antwerp, anno 1614.)

And St. Ambrose—"In fine, Peter is made head (præponitur) of the Church, after having been tempted; and thereby the Lord first revealed that which came after, when He chose him shepherd of the flock of the Lord; for to him He said, 'But thou being converted strengthen thy brethren.' (In Psal. xliii., p. 904, tom. i., Paris, anno 1684.)

The inconsistency, after what we have now seen, of bringing SS. Cyprian and Chrysostom against St. Peter's supremacy is, to say the least of it, unparalleled. And with as little reason is St. Augustine objected; for, though he has few words on this text, still they are enough to redeem him. He remarks, "When there was said to him, the first Apostle, 'I will give thee the keys,' he signified the whole Church," &c. (Tract 124, in Joan. n. 5.)

The multitude of epithets denoting headship or supreme jurisdiction given to St. Peter, by about 50 Greek and Latin fathers, would fill a letter equal in size to this.

Eu-ebius calls him the "Coryphaeus," or head "of the Apostles." (In Psal. 69, t. i., p. 378. Nov. Collect.)

Anthony, the hermit of Egypt, anno 300—"The prince of the Apostles." (Ep. 17, t. iv., p. 639. Galland.)

James, Bishop of Nisibis, anno 325—"The head of the Apostles." (Orat. vii., de Pæn. p. 57. t. v., *ibid.*)

St. Hilary—"The prince of the Apostleship" (Com. in Matt. t. i., p. 701.)

St. Cyril of Alexandria—"τον κορυφαῖον καὶ προτραγεῖον," the prince and ruler of the Apostles." (Lib. 12, in Joan. Edit. Par., an. 1633, p. 1113), as do also SS. Cyril of Jerusalem, and Epiphanius.

St. Optatus—"Head of all the Apostles." (Lib. 2, *Contra. Parm.*)

St. Gregory Nazianzum—"Prince of the Apostles." (p. 423. tom. vi., Galland.)

St. Chrysostom—"Head of the Apostolic choir." (Hom. ii., in Psal. 50.)

St. Ephrem, Syrus—"Head over the brethren." "The Coryphaeus." (Aesep. Bibl. Orient. t. i., p. 95, Et. t. iii., Gr. de Caritat. p. 14.)

Theodoret—"The first and the Coryphaeus of the choir of the Apostles." (Tom. iv., sp. 36, Flav. episc., p. 1157.)

And St. Jerome, three times—"The prince of the Apostles." (Cont. Pelag. n. 14.)

I must here stop to thank you most sincerely for your kind presentation of the latest number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, just received, and for the uncommon fidelity with which my undeserving letter is there published; and also to regret the offensive words which an erroneous prejudice of mine led me to use; and, lastly, to answer in brief the requests in your observations thereon.

1st. I have read the January and February, 1857, numbers, which you refer me to.

2nd. I protest the whole paragraph beginning with, "If the first proposition fails, the second becomes impossible" (p. 10), is to me, for the present, unintelligible; and, therefore, I cannot reply to it. For the meaning of the word "supremacy," as understood by Catholics—see the extracts given above from SS. Eucherius and Cyril.

3rd. "If St. Peter was not Bishop of Rome, we know not how the Bishops of Rome could be his successors?" Answer. Christ made St. Peter head of the whole Catholic Church. And he who is elected by the Church to succeed St. Peter, succeeds him only in this capacity. But this successor, being only mortal, must live somewhere on earth; and why not at Rome?

4th. If you say that Ireneus, though ever so clear, requires to be interpreted; and yet you will not take the interpretation of Salmasius, the Calvinist, profoundly learned, sincere, and ardent in the cause; then well may you despise mine.

5th. "That Tertullian did not recognise any divine right in the Bishop of Rome" is as natural as that rebels should recognise none, either human or divine, in their liege. In a word, when Tertullian wrote this he had revolted against the Catholic Church; whereas he was yet a Catholic, when, in another place, he wrote—"Remember that the keys were given to Peter, and through him to the Church." Which doctrine is quite orthodox.

6th. "Will Dr. G. tell us whether he considers the

⁶ Reference can be given.

⁷ T. iv. Cœc., Labb. p. 425, C. D.

John xxi., 18, 19. Luke xxii. 31, 32.

⁸ John xxi. 18, 19.

⁹ In Epist. ad Eocan. c. 6, d. 639.

supreme authority, in matters of faith, to the Pope or a General Council?" Answer. I am certain you possess a great intellect; but am not so certain where it is lodged, whether in the pineal gland, or in the whole brain. So am I certain that there is now, and has been, many an article of faith, such as the real presence, confession of sins, &c., received by the whole Catholic Church—which reception makes them infallibly orthodox with me, though never, perhaps, formally defined by a General Council, as the nature of the Son was at Nicaea. But should any as yet undefined article (as the immaculate conception was, some years ago) come to be questioned by some Catholics, causing dissensions within the Church; then would assemble a Council in communion with the Pope, pending which, the orthodox belief on that article would be in suspense, but no longer. After the Council, it is settled. But, you ask, by whom, or in what way? I can no more answer this than I can its parallel—the metaphysical question above. Perhaps this will be rendered more intelligible by the answer you give to this question. Is this a Scriptural expression—"The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit is one and the same God;" or is the like to be found in any of the Ante-Nicene divines that have come down to our time? If yes, show me where. If no, then how came we to know so momentous a truth—so deep a mystery? If you say neither yes nor no, but that we arrived at it by profound interpretation of the rhapsodial texts of the first three centuries; then I reply, there is no knowing what interpretation may yet achieve.

Yours sincerely,
WILLIAM GERAGHTY.

[Dr. Geraghty has in the foregoing letter poured out such a torrent of references upon us that we can scarcely hope either to examine them all within the compass of a single number, nor, if we did, could we hope that one reader in a thousand would take the trouble of perusing what we should write in reply to them. We hope, however, to present our readers with enough to enable them to find their way through the labyrinth in which Dr. Geraghty's learning and industry has entangled them.

In reply to Dr. Geraghty's question, "Where is the whole current of Scripture in favour of investing a woman with the spiritual supremacy, or of lodging it in the crown?" we reply, that the "supremacy" which we attribute to the crown is a totally different thing from the "supremacy" which he attributes to the Pope.

We believe with him that Christ has committed "authority" to His Church. We differ with him in thinking that this "authority" is committed to "the Church," and not to the Pope. We do not differ from him by holding that this authority is given to the crown of England. We hold that the crown of England has no share or part in that spiritual authority which Christ has committed to his Church.

But we believe that the power of temporal law and external coercion is given to princes, and not to the Bishops or the Pope.

It is the duty of princes to support by temporal law and power the authority which Christ has committed to His Church. The crown, which gives that temporal support, is supreme in the administration of that temporal support. This is all the "supremacy" we attribute to the crown. We maintain this against the Bishop of Rome, who has claimed supreme control over temporal power in England in respect of spiritual authority.

We may return to this subject again; but we trust that what we have now said is sufficient to explain to Dr. Geraghty our notions about the "supremacy of the crown."

We scarcely think that Dr. Geraghty has treated us, or, indeed, himself, fairly, when he satisfies himself with replying to our assertion about Father Launoy having collected 44 extracts from the fathers, which treat the *faith that St. Peter confessed*, and not Peter himself, as the rock on which the Church was built, by saying "there must be some mistake here." Father Launoy is no obscure writer; his works are of easy access to every man of Dr. Geraghty's learning, and we gave the exact reference to the place in which the extracts are to be found.^a Dr. Geraghty does not say that he has consulted Launoy, and that we have mistaken or misrepresented his meaning; nor does he venture to assert that any of Launoy's extracts are spurious. Dr. Geraghty will find that Launoy gives, honestly, nearly every name relied on by Dr. G. himself, with the exception of two or three comparatively obscure ones; the only difference being, that Dr. G. makes out 51 instead of 22, by counting the *passages* quoted instead of the *fathers* he quotes, while Father Launoy, we think, properly counts each of the 44 fathers only as one, though in some cases he gives three or four extracts from each; if he had counted *passages* instead of *fathers*, as Dr. G. has done, he would have much exceeded Dr. G.'s list of 51 quotations, which we think ought only to count as 22. But whether the number in favour of Dr. G.'s interpretation be 51 or 22, while there are 44 or 64 on the other side, we think we are equally well justified in the assertion we made, viz., that there is no such *universal consent* of the fathers as to the true interpretation of the passage in Matthew xvi., as would make it at all safe to base such a fabric upon it as the Papal supremacy. As to the sup-

posed distinction between using words in a literal and a casual sense (whatever that means), we think we might just as well retort the argument, and say Launoy's extracts from the 44 fathers were the literal, and Dr. G.'s the casual sense; and, indeed, how the Church could be built upon the *person* of any man, except in a highly figurative or allegorical sense, we are at a loss to conceive; in a literal sense the expression would obviously be mere nonsense. That our blessed Lord was speaking allegorically or figuratively, not literally, seems to us to be perfectly certain, and if so, why might He not build His Church as well upon the *faith confessed* by Peter as upon Peter himself, just as the Church of England may be said to be built upon the ancient confessions of faith known as the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, or the Church of Germany on the confession of Augsburg?

As to the grandiloquent speech made by Celestine's legate at the Council of Ephesus, *on which nothing turned*, and which led to no recognition of the Papal authority, we think the "*nemine contradicente*" of Dr. Geraghty amounts to very little more than this, (even if we could safely rely on its authenticity),^b that no one was then so longsighted as to anticipate what a length Papal assumptions were likely thereafter to grow, or so captious or ill-bred as to interrupt the legate in his oratorical flourishes. Pope Celestine, it will be recollect, was one of the popes who was concerned in endeavouring to foist the "*supremacy*" of Rome on the Church of Africa, on the authority of a false canon of the Council of Nice. So that we do not much regard what that pope's legates may have said. That, it would be a great delusion, however, to infer from such a speech that the *authority* of the Bishop of Rome over both the Eastern and Western Churches was then unanimously acknowledged we can prove demonstratively from the canons of the very Council of Chalcedon to which Dr. Geraghty also refers; but as this would lead us into too long a disquisition, we defer entering upon that point for the present, hoping to resume it ere long in a future number.

It is utterly out of our power to follow Dr. Geraghty at present, through the writings of St. Eucherius, St. Asterius, St. Orsarius, or others of little note in the 5th century, nor if we could, do we think such comparatively obscure writers could add much weight to such testimonies as those of St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, St. Epiphanius, or St. Chrysostom, on whom Dr. Geraghty also relies, if they were at all clear upon the matter in question. We have not time at this moment to examine with the care they deserve the passages referred to, but from other passages which we cited in our 6th vol., pp. 17, 18, from these very fathers and others, we think we were quite justified in saying with Dr. Barrow, "How could those great masters more clearly express their mind that our Lord in those words^c to St. Peter did *inculcate a duty nowise peculiar to him*, but equally, together with him, belonging to *all* guides of the Church, in such manner as when a master doth press a duty on one servant, he doth thereby admonish *all* his servants to the like duty."^d

As to the quotations from Eusebius, St. Hilary, St. Cyril, St. Optatus, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Chrysostom, &c., in which St. Peter is styled prince, or head, or leader of the Apostles, and the like, we think they may be safely disposed of as beside the real question, which is not one of rank or precedence, but one of authority and jurisdiction. A duke may be the head of the House of Peers, or a distinguished orator the leader of the House of Commons, without having the slightest authority or jurisdiction over the rest of the house, in which he has the acknowledged pre-eminence in rank or talent. A celebrated singer may be the head of a choir; a Cicero or Demosthenes may be the prince of orators, or a Shakespeare the prince of poets, without implying the slightest authority or jurisdiction over either their contemporaries or their successors; and just so may St. Peter have been spoken of rhetorically as the "prince or head of the Apostles" without the slightest intention on the part of the writer to convey that he had even so much power over the rest of the Apostles, as the chairman of a committee or president of society has over the body whose deliberations he presides over.

We asked our correspondent a simple question, whether he considers the supreme authority in matters of faith to be the pope or a general council; and in doing so we only asked, in fact, to which of two great parties, which long divided the Roman Catholic Church, Dr. G. belongs. This was the great question discussed and decided one way by the Council of Basle, A.D. 1432-1438, but whose decrees were afterwards disputed by the popes. It is, we think, a question that must be decided by every sincere Roman Catholic one way or other; and if Dr. G. expects to convert us or our readers to his Church, he is bound distinctly to let us know where its authority is

seated. No one, for instance, can now join the Roman Catholic Church without (we presume) adopting, with the rest, the recently defined dogma of the immaculate conception. We know that it was not defined by the authority of a general council. If the seat of supreme authority in matters of faith be in the pope, then we should be bound by this newly defined article of faith; but if the seat of infallibility be in a general council, or in a general council jointly with the pope, we should not be bound to receive this dogma. It is, therefore, not a merely theoretical or metaphysical, but a practical inquiry of the utmost importance. We can very well, with Dr. G., afford to confess our ignorance where the intellect is lodged, whether it be in the pineal gland or in the whole brain; for it does not in the least degree alter or modify our estimate either as to the power or soundness of the intellect, whether it is situated in the one or in the other. It is quite otherwise of the seat of authority. We rather collect that Dr. G. thinks a general council necessary; for he says, "Should any undefined article (such as the immaculate conception was some years ago) come to be questioned by some Catholics, causing dissensions within the Church, then would assemble a council in communion with the pope, pending which the orthodox belief on that article would be in suspense, but no longer. After the council, it is settled." But we think, if this be Dr. G.'s opinion, viz., that a general council, in connection with the pope, is necessary, we must still consider the disputed doctrine of the immaculate conception to be in suspense; for, assuredly, it was not only questioned by multitudes of Roman Catholics, and caused terrible dissensions within the Church for several centuries, but no council has yet assembled to define it. The pope took on himself to do so by his own authority, without a council. Therefore it must, according to that view, be still in suspense, and not yet settled! Will Dr. G. tell us frankly, is that doctrine yet settled or is it in suspense? We are sure he is candid and manly enough to give us a distinct answer. And we pause to receive it. We do not think our correspondent can parry the question which involves so disputed a point, by asking us another about a matter in which we fully agree—viz., the mysterious doctrine of the Holy Trinity. If he requires to know how we came to believe in it, we answer frankly, because we think it to be capable of satisfactory proof out of the holy Scriptures, which we believe to contain all things necessary to salvation. As to the word Trinity, as it is not to be found in Scripture, we attach no importance to it, except as a convenient and expressive term universally used by all denominations of Christians, whether agreeing with it or not. If a man believes in the Divinity of our blessed Lord, and the personality of the Holy Ghost, and is baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as our Lord commanded before He ascended into heaven, he is a believer in the Trinity, though he had never heard the word in his lifetime. This is no matter of "profound interpretation" or "rhapsodical textis;" though we, of course, are fortified in the soundness of our interpretation by finding that it was the uniform belief of the first three centuries, and that none of the ante-Nicene fathers can be shown to have entertained the slightest doubt or difference of opinion on it. Till the time of Arius, about the year 315, we can find no trace of any contrary opinion in any part of the Christian Church, and we know that the new opinion was scarcely publicly stated, when the whole Church of Alexandria, of which Arius was a presbyter, was at once in arms, and within five years at the utmost, in A.D. 320, Arius's doctrine was condemned, and Arius himself, with several of the clergy who followed him, were excommunicated and expelled from the city, by a council of nearly one hundred bishops of Egypt and Libya, held at Alexandria, as recorded by St. Epiphanius (Haer. 69, n. 3). But even if we could not so clearly trace the rise and date of the Anti-Trinitarian heresy, we should still be quite satisfied that the doctrine of the Trinity was a revealed truth, from the holy Scriptures alone, which we hold to be, when rightly interpreted, according to the rules of sound criticism, the rule of faith given us by God to guide us into all truth.

KEENAN'S CATECHISM IN KILPATRICK.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—I met Peter Doyle again last Sunday morning, and said I, "What's become of you ever since, Peter? the boys have been looking out for you and were disappointed you did not come." "Well," said he, "we left off in the middle of a chapter of Keenan, and I don't mind going to finish it for you." "I think," said I, "that as you read us your books the last couple of evenings, it would be only fair play now that you should hear a little of ours; but, however, we'll take you on your own terms, and Keenan let it be."

So when he came up and got out his book: "Do you remember," said he, "that I left off where he was saying how the Catholic doctrines are misrepresented by Protestants?"

Q. "Do not these ministers labour earnestly to impress the people with the notion that our doctrines are absurd?"

A. "Yes; and by this have prevented many from inquiring. Yet how unfounded is this assertion. If our doctrines are absurd, why are they believed by five-sixths of Christianity?"

"By how much?" said Malone.

"Five-sixths of Christianity," said Peter.

^a Opera. Joannis Launoli, tom. v, pt. 2. Lib. v., Epist. vii., ad Guliel. Voellum, p. 106. Col. Allobrog., 1781.

^b It is a great mistake to suppose that the Records of the Councils, as we have them now, were drawn up and settled in the Councils themselves. Of some parts of those records, such as the Canons, Creeds, &c., we have proof from the first. Some other parts of the present records, we have no authority for except Anastasius, the librarian of the Pope's library at Rome, about the year 870; remarkable for the publication of many forged and interpolated documents.

^c As to St. Cyprian, we have an article in type, for which we have not room in our present number; and we hope to take an early opportunity to examine Dr. Geraghty's remaining quotations also.

^d Barrow on the Supremacy, p. 108.